

### Remarks


The claims have been amended to call for a voice message instead of a telephonic message.

The Board of Appeals in Appeal No. 2003-0185 in this case found that a telephonic message was broader than a voice message. The cited reference to Pepe was found to teach a telephonic message because it did mark a voice message as urgent. The identification of the message as urgent was found to be part of the message. See Board's Decision at page 8, the bottom four lines. The Board found that converting a portion of the message to text included "identification of the message as urgent" (even though nothing was converted). See Board's Decision at the top of page 9. Clearly, Pepe does not teach converting a voice message as defined by the Board to text.

In view of these remarks, the application should now be in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respect fully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 10, 2004



---

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]